

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-7, 9-10, and 12 were presented for examination. The Office Action dated August 5, 2008 rejects claims 1, 3-4, 6-7, 9-10, and 12. This paper amends claims 1 and 7. No new matter has been added. Claims 1, 3-4, 6-7, 9-10, and 12 remain pending in this application.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3-4, 6-7, 9-10, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0050914 to Akahane et al. ("Akahane") in view of Applicant's admitted prior art ("AAPA"). Applicants do not admit that Akahane is prior art and continue to reserve the right to remedy any defects in the Affidavit under 37 U.S.C. §1.131 submitted in Applicants' Response to Final Rejection filed November 21, 2005. Nonetheless, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, since Akahane, even if assumed to be prior art, and AAPA, taken in part or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the elements of the Applicants' claimed invention.

The Applicants' invention, as now set forth in representative Claim 1, recites, in pertinent part, a router that has a plurality of router interfaces through which packets are received from a plurality of address domains. A separate routing table in the router is dedicated to each domain and each router interface is associated with one of the routing tables. In addition, the router executes a single IP stack to receive a packet from any of the router interfaces and to identify the associated routing table in the router for handling the packet. In the event of a route change received from more than one of the plurality of address domains, the router updates each routing table associated with each address domain for which a route change has been received via the single IP stack. Thus, independent routing table updates do not the scalability problems associated with prior art routers. (Applicant's specification, [0029]).

The Office Actions have repeatedly admitted that Akahane does not expressly disclose executing a single IP stack to receive packets from any of the interfaces. And, in fact, Akahane does not address IP stacks, or route table management, at all. Thus, Akahane fails to teach or suggest the Applicants' claimed step of "executing a single IP stack to receive a packet from any of the router interfaces and to identify the associated routing table for handling the received packet", and clearly fails to teach or suggest the Applicants' further claimed step of "in the event of a route change received from more than one of the plurality of address domains, updating each routing table associated with each address domain for which a route change has been received via the single IP stack." The AAPA also clearly does not teach or suggest this claimed step, since this is the very problem described there, the solution to which is claimed by the Applicant and described in the Applicants' specification. (Applicant's specification [0029]).

Each other independent claim recites language similar to that of claim 1, and therefore is patentable for at least the reasons provided in connection with claim 1. Each dependent claim depends directly or indirectly from one of the patentable independent claims, and incorporates all of its respective limitations and, therefore, is patentably distinguishable over the cited references for at least those reasons provided in connection with the independent claims. Each dependent claim also recites an additional limitation, which, in combination with the elements and limitations of its independent claim, further distinguishes that dependent claim from the cited references. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of these claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and arguments made herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance and requests early favorable action by the Examiner.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with the Applicant's representative would expedite allowance of this application, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned at (508) 303-2003, or at the Applicants' mobile, (617) 901-6786.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 9, 2009
Reg. No. 37,946

Fax No.: (508) 303-0005
Tel. No.: (508) 303-2003

/Mary Steubing/
Mary Steubing
Attorney for Applicants
Guerin & Rodriguez, LLP
5 Mount Royal Avenue
Marlborough, MA 01752